DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 080 069 HE 004 430

TITLE	Report of the Special Committee on the Status of Women at UCSC.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Santa Cruz. Special Committee on the Status of Women at UCSC.
REPORT NO	AS-SCP-351-1
PUB DATE	Oct 71
NOTE	30p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Females; *Higher Education; Leave of Absence; *Sex Discrimination; *Women Professors
IDENTIFIERS	*Affirmative Action Plan; University of California Santa Clara

ABSTRACT

The status of women at the University of California-Santa Clara is indicated in reference to faculty numbers, rank, administration, regularization of nonladder appointments, tenure, merit increases, and termination. Recommendations suggest: (1) UCSC should strive to achieve in its ladder ranks a percentage of women equal to that of women who received Ph.D.'s from the 10 leading universities between 1962-1967, that is 12% (2) UCSC should give high priority to correcting the imbalance existing in administration and policymaking positions; (3) Boards of studies and colleges should review their recruitment procedures; (4) UCSC should not neglect minority needs; (5) any faculty should be entitled to unpaid maternity leave of two quarters; (6) any nontenured faculty members who become pregnant should be allowed an extension of the appointment for one year for each pregnancy; and (7) the Special Committee on the Status of Women should be continued for another year. (MJM)

ED 080069

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

October 1971

AS/SCP/351-1

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA ACADEMIC SENATE

SANTA CRUZ DIVISION

REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN AT UCSC

To the Santa Cruz Division:

Given the history of UCSC, its character and its special educational goals, our concern is to seek ways in which this campus can best discharge its responsibilites toward women in the teaching ranks. The primary task is to insure that we recruit, then encourage talented and dedicated women as new faculty and students. We should be making every effort to insure the full participation of women and to evoke their contributions if we are to pursue the overall goal of the University for academic preeminence. In addition to these intrinsic reasons there is the fact that HEW's implementation of Executive Order 11375 (October, 1967) is presently requiring institutions to present affirmative action programs. (See Appendix #1.)

The Committee proposes the following:

1. UCSC should strive to achieve in its ladder ranks a percentage of women equal to that of women who received Ph.D.'s from the ten leading universities between 1962-67; that is, 12%. Targets for each College and each Division should be determined taking into account the percentage of women in the respective fields that are represented. This balance should be attained in the non-tenured ranks within six years. (See Appendix #1.)

2. UCSC should give high priority to correcting the extreme imbalance that presently exists in administration and policy making positions in the Boards of Studies, Colleges, and Central Administration.

3. Boards of Studies and Colleges should review their recruitment procedures to determine whether, in fact, they are exploring the total pool of excellence. In making oral or written enquiries, they should specify that they are interested in able women as well as men. Also, they might refer to the files of qualified women that many professional organizations are compiling. (See Appendix #2.)

4. In striving to meet targets in regard to the hiring of women, UCSC must be scrupulous in not neglecting the hiring of minority faculty.

5. Any faculty member should be entitled to unpaid maternity leave of two quarters. Her rights as a member of the faculty should continue without interruption.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

HE 004 430

6. Any non-tenured faculty member who becomes pregnant during her appointment should be allowed an extension of her appointment for one year for each pregnancy, not to exceed a total of two years. This extension may occur whether or not she has gone on a part-time schedule or taken maternity leave.*

7. The Special Committee on the Status of Women should be continued for another year in order to complete studies already begun, including surveys of faculty spouses and women students. The following year, a campuswide committee combining the Chancellor's committee and the Senate Special Committee should be established and charged with the responsibility of surveying the progress made in achieving equality of opportunity for women.

In addition to the above, this Committee asks the Senate to endorse the following general policy directions and charge next year's Committee to draw up more specific recommendations:

1. UCSC should set forth methods whereby some men and women could hold less than full-time appointments during some portion of their working careers without sacrificing eligibility for promotion, tenure, and sabbatical leave, which could be earned at an appropirately equitable diminished rate.

2. UCSC should contribute regularly to the support of a child care center for students, staff, and faculty.

3. UCSC should develop guidelines whereby eligible faculty wives who wish employment can be assured of equitable consideration for ladder positions and can be assured that the conditions of employment in other areas will be non-exploitive.

*The Harvard and Radcliffe reports recommend the same practice.

STATISTICS ON FACULTY

1970-71

As the following table indicates, the proportion of women in faculty positions of all ranks at Santa Cruz in 1970-71 was 9.5%. Among the non-ladder teaching ranks, the proportion was much larger (25.5%); in the ranks of temporary and replacement personnel, it was also higher (15.0%). The lowest proportion was to be found among the most prestigious and secure positions, the professorial ranks (on the academic ladder), where women formed only 7.9% of the faculty.

Among Boards of Studies, there were no women of any rank on 15 of 24 Boards, and no women of professorial rank on 16 Boards. In all the sciences, there was only one woman of any rank.

Among Colleges, two (Stevenson and Merrill) had a proportion of women higher than the campus average, while three (Cowell, Crown, and College V) had a lower proportion. Two of these Colleges had only one woman each in the professorial ranks, and none of the three had more than three women of any rank.

One important contribution of women on the faculty is to provide advisers and varied role models for women students, a function that is most important for those Boards of Studies with a high proportion of women majors. There are seven Boards with more than 50% women majors, and 13 with more than 40%. Yet of these 13 Boards, seven had no women in professorial ranks and none had more than two.

Comparing the proportion of women faculty by field with what may be considered a relevant pool of candidates - the proportion of women in that field receiving Ph.D.'s - reveals that only four of the 17 Boards of Studies for which we have statistics had a higher proportion at UCSC than in the pool while 13 Boards had a much lower proportion. These 13 Boards may be said to be recruiting a disproportionately high number of men from their pools of available candidates.

Finally, the comparison between the proportion of women among Ph.D.'s of the top 10 graduate departments and the proportion among all Ph.D.'s produced nationally shows that women do not cluster in the less distinguished schools, despite their reputed lower geographic mobility.

Faculty Women at Santa Cruz 1970-71

	ART	HISTORY	LITERATURE	PHILOSOPHY	LINGUISTICS	MUSIC	RELIGIOUS STUDIES	THEATER ARTS	ECONOMICS	PSYCHOLOGY	SOCIOLOGY	EDUCATION	GEOGRAPHY
# Undergrad Majors	27	181	249	74	9	15	17		35	269	112		
% Women Under. Maj	55.6	44.2	67.5	27.0	88.9	46.7	41.2		5.7	50.9	50.9		
# Graduate Students		12	32							11			
% Women (A)		25	43.8							45.5			
# Professorial Ranks	6.5	14.5	28	6.5	2	5	0	2.5	11	13.5	8.5	1	3
# Women	0	0	5	0	0	1	0	1.5	0	1	1	0	0
% Women	0	0	17.8	0	0	20	0	60.0	0	7.4	11.8	0	0
# Teaching Ranks (B)	2	0	4	1	0	.2	0	3	0	1	2	.8	0
# Women	1	0	1	0	0	.2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
% Women	50.0	0	25.0	0	0	100	0	33.3	0	0	0	0	0
#Temporary and Replacements (C)	0	.8	15.2	2.2	0	1.2	0	.3	0	1	2.7	.2	0
# Women	0	0	2.8	0	0	.2	0	.3	0	0	0	0	0
% Women	0	0	18.6	0	0	16.7	0	100	0	0	0	0	0
# All Titles	8.5	15.3	47.2	9.7	2	6.4	0	5.8	11	15.5	13.2	2.0	3
# Women	1	0	8.8	0	0	1.4	0	2.8	0	1	1	0	0
% Women	11.7	0	18.6	0	0	21.9	0	48.2	0	6.4	7.6	0	0
% Women PhD (D) Top 5 Univ.		11.7	(1) 24.6	7.1					7.3	24	24.2		
% Women PhD Top 10 Univ.		13.0	25.5	7.7					6.8	22.7	20.4		
% Women PhD (E) Nationally	(6) 34	7 13	(2) 31	9.1	20.6	14.5		34		22.5	18.5		

Faculty Women at Santa Cruz 1970-71

	POLITICS	ANTHROPOLOGY	COMMUNITY STUDIES	ASTRONOMY	BIOLOGY	CHEMISTRY	EARTH SCIENCES	MATHEMATICS	PHYSICS	INFORMATION SCIENCES	ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES	NON-BOARD	TOTAL
# Undergrad Majors	94	72	57		142	29	13	62	30	14	17	118	
% Women Under. Maj	28.7	58.3	52.6		45.8	13.8	15.4	24.2	10.0	42.9	47.1	50.8	
# Graduate Students				22	31	26	18	6	12				
% Women (A)				4.5	22.5	11.5	11.1	33.3	0				
# Professorial Ranks	12	8	1.5	2.8	12	12	5	11	11.5	4.5	0	1	183.3
# Women	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14.5
% Women	16.7	25.0	0	0	8.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7.9
# Teaching Ranks (B)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	.5	0	0	0	16.5
# Women	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.2
% Women	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25.5
# Temporary and Replacements (C)	.2	.7	0	.5	.7	.6	1	3	0	0	.3	3.6	34.0
# Women	.2	.7	0	0	.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	.7	5.1
% Women	100	100	0	0	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	18.9	15.0
# All Titles	12.2	8.7	2.5	3.3	12.7	12.6	6	14	12	4.5	.3	4.6	236.7
# Women	2.2	2.7	0	0	1.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	.7	22.5
% Women	18.0	31.0	0	0	10.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	15.2	9.5
% Women PhD (D) Top 5 Univ.	12.1	(3) 20.6		12.3	4 29.4	5 6.9		5.0	2.5				
% Women PhD Top 10 Univ.	11.7	20.5		11.5	23.4	8.2		5.8	2.6				
% Women PhD (E) Nationally	11.3	23.9				8		6					

EXPLANATIONS

A Includes Professor, Associate Professor, Assistant Professor, and Acting Associate and Assistant Professors. Each counted according to terms of appointment according to accounting procedures; Provosts are counted as full members of Boards, Executive Vice Chancellor is counted as a full member of Boards, Divisional Vice Chancellors are counted as half, Chancellor is not counted.

B Includes Lecturers, Associates, and Acting Instructors who are considered "regular" appointments, meaning that they are paid out of hard money, and are not considered as replacements or fill-in personnel. Two have security of employment.

C Includes all persons paid from soft money, replacements for faculty on unpaid leave, and fill-in personnel appointed until the position is filled with a regular appointment.

D Figures used are those reported in the Report of the Subcommittee on the Status of Academic Women on the Berkeley campus, Table XII which drew figures from A. M. Cartter, "An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education," American Council of Education, 1966, which reports an average for years 1964-5, 1965-6, 1967-8.

E Figures are drawn from WEAL, Women's Equity Action League, from 1967-8 Earned Degrees Conferred: Part A - Summary data, U. S. Office of Education, except as otherwise indicated.

1 Includes English, French, German and Spanish-Portuguese--not Russian or Classics

2 Modern Language Association figure.

3 Does not include Physical Anthropology.

4 Does not include Bio-chemistry which is taught by both Biology and Chemistry Boards of Studies at UCSC. Listed in Berkeley report as Zoology, does not include Botony.

5 Does not include Bio-chemistry.

6 Used Fine and Applied Arts, not General Art.

7 Used Speech and Dramatic Arts.

1970-71

	COWELL	STEVENSON	CROWN	MERRILL	COLLEGE V	KRESGE	NON-COLLEGE	TOTAL
# Professorial ranks	35	47	34	26	35	3	5.8	
# Women	1	6	2	4.5	1	0	0	
% Women	2.8	12.7	5.8	17.3	2.8	0	0	
# Teaching Ranks	4	0	1	6	3	0	3	
# Women	1	0	0	1	1	0	.2	
% Women	25	0	0	16.6	33.3	0	6.6	
# Temporary and Replacements	6.3	2.7	2.4	1.2	5.7	0	16.5	
# Women	0	.7	.2	0	.7	0	3.3	
% Women	0	25	8.3	0	11.6	0	19.9	
# All Titles	45.3	49.7	36.2	33.2	43.7	3	25.3	
# Women	2	6.7	2.2	5.5	2.7	0	3.5	
% Women	4.4	13.4	6.1	16.5	6.1	0	13.8	

STATISTICS ON FACULTY

1971-72

The pattern in 1971-72 was substantially the same. From 1970-71 to 1971-72, the proportion of women in professorial ranks increased by .2% to 8.1% and in the non-ladder teaching ranks by 1.7% to 27.2%.

Five Boards of Studies hired a woman for the first time, all in professorial ranks. Four of these were new to the campus and the fifth was regularized from the teaching ranks. One of those hired was in science, raising the number of women in science to two. On the other hand, one Board lost its only woman in professorial ranks while another lost two of its five women in these ranks. 12 Boards remain with no women in professorial ranks and 11 with none in either professorial nor teaching ranks. (We were unable to get statistics on temporary and replacement personnel for this year.)

A comparison of the recruitment of women with the proportion of women majors reveals that of the 13 Boards of Studies with more than 40% women students, six still had no women in professorial ranks and five had none in professorial or teaching ranks.

There are still 13 Boards with a higher proportion of men than in the pool of candidates.

Of the old Colleges, three kept the same number of women in professorial ranks, despite increases in the total FTE strength in two of them. Two of the old Colleges lost women. In its first year of operation, Kresge had two women on a faculty of 15.

In the teaching ranks, College V and Crown each gained a woman, or a portion thereof, while Stevenson and Kresge remained the same and Cowell lost one.

Proportion of Women in Various Titles
Academic Year 1971-72 UCSC

ART	HISTORY	LITERATURE	PHILOSOPHY	LINGUISTICS	MUSIC	RELIGIOUS STUDIES	THEATER ARTS	ECONOMICS	PSYCHOLOGY	SOCIOLOGY	EDUCATION	GEOGRAPHY
7.5	16.5	31	7.5	3	5	0	3.5	10	12.5	9.5	3	4.5
1	0	3	0	0	1	0	2.5	1	1	0	0	1
13.3	0	9.7	0	0	20	0	71.4	10	8	0	0	22.2
2		6	2	0	1.2	0	2	0	1	1	0	0
1	0	2	0	0	.4	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
50	0	33.3	0	0	33.3	0	0	0	0	100.	0	0

POLITICS	ANTHROPOLOGY	COMMUNITY STUDIES	ASTRONOMY	BIOLOGY	CHEMISTRY	EARTH SCIENCES	MATHEMATICS	PHYSICS	INFORMATION SCIENCES	ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES	NON-BOARD	TOTAL
12	8	2.5	4	15	13	7	12	11.5	6.5	0	1	206.
2.5	2	.5	.2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16.7
20.8	25	20	5	6.7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8.1
0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16.2
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4.4
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27.2

1971-72

	COWELL	STEVENSON	CROWN	MERRILL	COLLEGE V	KRESGE	NON-COLLEGE	TOTAL
# Professorial ranks	37.0	45.5	34.0	28.5	40.0	15.0	6.0	206.0
# Women	1.0	6.0	2.0	3.5	1.0	2.0	.2	15.7
% Women	2.7	13.1	5.8	12.3	2.5	13.3	3.3	7.6
# Teaching ranks	1.0	0	2.0	4.0	5.0	0	4.2	16.2
# Women	0	0	.2	1.0	2.0	0	1.2	4.4
# Temporary and Replacements	.5	1.0	1.6	0	0	1.0	12.1	16.1
# Women	0	0	.6	0	0	0	5.3	5.9
% Women	0	0	40.0	0	0	0	44.6	36.6
# All Titles	38.5	46.5	37.6	32.5	45.0	16.0	22.2	238.3
# Women	1.0	6.0	2.8	4.5	3.0	2.0	6.7	26.0
% Women	2.6	12.9	7.4	13.8	6.6	12.5	30.2	10.9

Women in Decision-making Positions

As indicated in table below there are few women in policy-making positions at Santa Cruz. The reasons for this must be considered with reference to the pool from which incumbents are recruited and the manner of recruitment. In the case of Senior Administrators, recruitment is, to a large degree, independent of recruitment to faculty positions, and is undertaken by the administration. Since we have not studied the nature of this recruitment process, we can only point to the fact that there is only one woman among the senior administrators on this campus.

	Men	Women	% Women
Senior Administrators[1]	12	1	7.7
College Administrators[2]	21	1	4.5
Board Chairmen	25	0	0
Chancellorial Committees (1969-72)			
Faculty	367	26	7.0
Students	105	26	24.7
Senate Committees (1969-72)	231	20	8.6

Notes:

[1]Chancellor, Vice Chancellors, Assistant Chancellors, Deans, Associate Dean, Head of Library, Administrator of Campus Health Center

[2]Provosts, Deputy Provosts, Senior Preceptors

In the case of College Administrators, Board Chairmen, and Chancellorial and Senate Committees, recruitment is predominately from the pool of faculty on campus. The relevant pool may be considered to be the faculty on campus, primarily those in professorial ranks. The statistics indicate that women are recruited to committees in approximately the same proportion as they are recruited to the faculty. They are not, however, appointed to the more important decision-making positions, Head of Committees and Board Chairmen, in as high a proportion. Nor are they appointed to the positions in Colleges which make the most decisions regarding student life in the Colleges, Senior Preceptors, nor to the high policy-making positions, Provosts. This also has a structural basis, for recruitment to these positions is almost entirely from the tenured ranks, in which there are only four women at UCSC.

In summary, because the pool of candidates is small, the recruitment of women to decision-making administrative positions is restricted. This must be seen as a further cost of the limited recruitment of women to faculty positions at Santa Cruz.

Finally, the statistics show a much lower proportion of women students appointed to Chancellorial Committees than men students. This may be partially explained with reference to the pool of candidates for many of the students appointed are graduate students, among whom men form a higher proportion. Since there are equal numbers of men and women among undergraduates, however, the predominance of men among students appointed to these committees is noteworthy.

RECRUITING

As statistics regarding women Ph.D.'s indicate, there are many women in most fields who might be considered eligible for Santa Cruz without any relaxation of standards of merit. This is confirmed by our interviews with Board Chairmen, most of whom said there were many excellent women in their fields.

Furthermore, interviews with Provosts and Board Chairmen, as well as written replies from Boards of Studies, indicated very little hostility toward the hiring of women.

Finally, study of the recruitment process showed that a large number of Boards of Studies have brought women to campus for consideration.

Yet statistics indicate that a very low proportion of women have been hired. We have identified the following remediable problems that have made hiring of women difficult at Santa Cruz:

1. The prohibition against part-time ladder positions limits the pool of women candidates available. Not only does it restrict the total number in the pool, but, given the geographic isolation of Santa Cruz, it tends to restrict the pool to single women. All but one of the women now holding a ladder position are single.

2. Nepotism rules have prevented hiring women in a few cases. However, the July 29, 1971 revision of Section 113 of the Administrative Manual and Staff Personnel Rule 7.6 essentially abolishes the "nepotism" rule. (See Appendix #4.)

3. Boards of Studies sometimes assume that a married woman would not come to Santa Cruz if her husband has a job elsewhere. In other cases they have been reluctant to hire a woman if they did not want her husband also. We suggest that this decision be left to the woman concerned, and not prejudged, unless the couple has specifically requested jobs for both as a condition of either one's accepting the position.

4. Because there are fewer women than men eligible for each position, it often takes longer to find them. The late allocation of FTE's means that Boards are often looking for candidates late in the year, and are unable to conduct a thorough search.

5. Narrow definitions of positions in fields where there are few women often preclude consideration of highly qualified women who may not exactly fit the specifications. We also realize, however, that Boards with graduate programs may have less flexibility in hiring because of the requirements of their programs.

6. In the early years of the campus, many Boards relied on networks of acquaintances to generate candidates. Since the networks tend to be within one sex, these informal recruiting procedures limited the number of women considered. In two cases we hear of positions being explicitly restricted to men: one in which the chairman appears to have decided in advance that there were no good women in the field (this is a Board that relied exclusively on networks of acquaintances, so there were no other ways in which women candidates might have turned up), and another position (yet to be filled) about which the chairman commented that a man would be preferable because the position involved working closely with the community. But an offer for the latter position has just been made to a woman.

7. Some chairmen say they would like "one or two women" on their Boards. This suggests tokenism and may act as a limitation on recruitment.

8. As indicated by the following comments, there is a tendency among some Board chairmen to discount women's qualifications for academic positions.

> "We would not want a strong woman because they make people uncomfortable."
>
> "If we could find a 'little girl' who is just finishing her thesis . . . . ."

In addition, one chairman continually referred to his recruiting as a search for the "best man" and another indicated that he writes recruiting letters asking about a "bright young man in . . . "

Finally, some assume that recruiting women will mean lowering standards. Several Provosts posed the hypothetical problem of choosing between a "first-rate man" and a "second-rate woman." This does not necessarily suggest that they see women as second-rate candidates. Their definition of the problem does suggest, however, that they assume the number of first-rate women is limited, and do not see how procedures of recruiting might be changed to expand the supply of first-rate women.

9. There is also a tendency to stereotype women into certain roles. One chairman indicated that his Board particularly wanted a woman in a field because it was concerned with children, while a Provost indicated he wanted a woman in art because of his College's project in children's art. Finally, several Provosts showed they saw women in counselling, rather than scholarly, roles in the University, by emphasizing their concern for women as Senior Preceptors and House Preceptors.

10. Few faculty wives with Ph.D.'s have been considered for ladder positions. One chairman reported that his Board had not considered two faculty wives who were in the field for which they were recruiting because the wives had not formally applied for the position. It appears that there is a tendency to discount the qualifications of faculty wives because of traditional assumptions about their role in the university.

REGULARIZATION, PROMOTION, AND TERMINATION

Among our considerations were questions of discrimination in promotion to tenure, merit increases, regularization of non-ladder appointments, and termination. In terminations of persons holding the rank of Associate, we found a statistical suggestion of discrimination, although we recognize that individual cases would necessarily have to be considered before this finding could be confirmed. In the other personnel matters, we find little evidence of difficulty.

In 1970 and 1971, 24 Assistant Professors were granted tenure, none of them women. Among Assistant Professors, 49 merit increases were granted, nine to women. Of 12 accelerated increases, one went to a woman; of three decelerated increases, one went to a woman. As for regularization of non-ladder appointments, four women were among the seven Lecturers regularized, and four among the seventeen Acting Assistant Professors regularized.

In the matter of terminations from 1968-71, fairness seems to have been the rule at all levels save that of Associate, where 14 women were among the 20 persons not rehired for reasons other than voluntary resignation. Paradoxically, this fact is largely accountable for (so the Committee was made to understand) by the effort of the language program to achieve a rough balance among the sexes in its personnel.

Informal interviews among men and women, and questionnaire responses from women, provide a view of problems in these areas which statistics cannot reveal. Many non-tenured faculty feel that procedures for review and promotion have not been made explicit, and that reporting of the substantive basis of formal decisions taken is inadequate. More difficult to pin down and more important to the individuals concerned is the lack of communication of informal assessments as these are constantly being made among colleagues throughout the year. This lack of communication, particularly when the informal assessments are negative and the situation is therefore uncomfortable, deprives young faculty of both forewarning of difficulties and constructive criticism that would foster professional growth. Though we see this as a general problem for both men and women, responses from women faculty indicate that it is a greater problem for them because they have less communication with male colleagues.

ACADEMIC TERMINATIONS
FOR THE PERIOD 7/1/68 through 6/30/71

Titles	Reasons for termination	
Professor	4 bona fide resignations	
	1 death	
	1 temporary appointment	
Associate Professor	1 bona fide resignation	
	2 temporary appointments	
Assistant Professor	10 bona fide resignations	1 woman
	1 "face-saving" resignation	
	2 deaths	
	6 terminal/nonreappointments	1 woman
	2 temporary appointments	
Supervisor of P. E.	1 bona fide resignation	
	1 "face-saving" resignation	1 woman
	1 death	
Acting Professor	4 temporary appointments	1 woman
Acting Assistant Professor	1 bona fide resignation	
	2 terminal/nonreappointments	1 woman
	9 temporary appointments	2 women
Lecturer	9 bona fide resignations	1 woman
	10 terminal/nonreappointments	2 women
	23 temporary appointments	2 women
Associate	6 bona fide resignations	4 women
	3 limitation of service	2 women
	5 terminal/nonreappointments	2 women
	12 temporary appointments	10 women

1. From Lecturer to Assistant Professor (regularization)

   7/1/68 - 2 (no women)

   7/1/69 - No record

   7/1/70 - 1 (no women)

   7/1/71 - 6 (4 women)

2. From Acting Assistant Professor to Assistant Professor (regularization)

   7/1/71 - 9 (3 women)

   7/1/70 - 8 (1)

3. Assistant Professor - Merit Increases

Eff.	Total MI's	Acc. MI's	Decc. MI's
7/1/70	27 (3 W)	9	1 (W)
7/1/71	22 (6 W)	3 (1W)	2 (M)

4. Promotions from Assistant Professor to Associate Professor (Tenure)

Eff.	Total
7/1/71	14 (no women)
7/1/70	10 (no women)

RESULTS OF A QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY OF FACULTY WOMEN AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA CRUZ

Early in 1972, a questionnaire was sent out to all faculty women to ascertain to what extent they had personally experienced discrimination and how they felt about a number of items related to being a female academic. Of 26 sent, 20 were returned.

In general the replies indicated that nearly all respondents had noticed to varying degrees special difficulties that academic life holds for women. Specific inquiry was directed to experiences before and during graduate study, job-hunting, and work at Santa Cruz. In addition, we sought suggestions for reform.

A summary of the background of the respondents indicates that, true to the general pattern, they cluster at the bottom of the teaching ranks, and none was a full professor. One of the married respondents has completed a Ph.D. and is a lecturer. Thus none of the married respondents is ranked higher than lecturer, while none of the single women is lower than assistant professor.

Graduate School

When asked what had motivated them to go to graduate school, 11 of the respondents mentioned sheer interest in the subject and only three mentioned encouragement of others. Five encountered opposition from parents, instructors, or friends, and three of these received no encouragement from anyone. Two women decided [illegible] graduate school largely because they had been actively [illegible]raged from applying to medical school.

Slightly more than half received encouragement and no opposition, a pattern one would expect to be even higher for such a prestigious goal; we regret the lack of comparable data for males. All attended top-rate schools and went to the one of her choice. One woman could not enter her preferred subfield, however, because bath facilities for women did not exist onboard the research station!

One woman mentioned that in addition to other discouragements, she knew that strict nepotism rules where her husband taught would make a full-time career virtually impossible and thus she gave up working for her Ph.D. A formerly married woman who did complete her degree mentioned similar discrimination which greatly hampered and slowed down her career. This seems to work especially against women in the same fields as their husbands.

Once in advanced studies, 13 of these women found that 40% or less of their peers were female. Three had mostly or all female peers and only two studied where the sex ratio was about 1:1.

15 did not find it harder to interact with male than with female students. Regarding student-faculty relations, however, difficulties arose. Seven felt they were treated worse by professors than were male students and none felt they had it better as women. Complaints included less respect, condescending attitudes, and greater formality on the part of faculty. One woman made a strong point about the importance of this, saying that the "apprentice system which exists to some extent in most graduate schools" is crucial because it leads the student "into professional networks . . and allows intellectual growth. The sexual threat between female student and male professors makes this relationship nearly impossible." In some cases, quite negative attitudes were encountered. For example,

> One (professor) said he was always against admitting women, who "used up" good places in the graduate program, but for a "girl" I'd done surprisingly well . . . was as smart as any man he'd seen. Hooray!

Job-Hunting

For eight, job-seeking contacts made toward the end of graduate work were in most cases established by each woman strictly on her own, while a professor actively helped six; the rest received other help or did not try at the time for various reasons. Of those who encountered what they felt to be sex discrimination, slightly more than half felt it was to their advantage due to recent compensatory hiring. Marriage seemed to be a problem for some, however, One did not try since she felt she had to adjust to what was available where her husband went. Another, while she tried, encountered the assumption that she would move with her husband's job changes or quit to have children. Another wrote, "Do we ever ask what a man's wife is going to do if he is hired?"

Working at UCSC

A majority felt that being female did matter at UCSC in terms of each of the following: Most troublesome were intellectual interactions with colleagues (9) and outside professional contacts (9). Troublesome to fewer, but still to more than one-fourth of the respondents, were salary (6) and administrative assignments (5). Few felt any problem in course assignments.

Regarding conditions of employment, some said they felt women had a slower rate of advancement up the ladder and a harder time getting tenure. The feeling of being in a men's club was common as well.

Stereotypes are also a problem, especially when one is not known. Regarding professional conferences, one woman wrote,

> "It is difficult as a woman to make contacts unless introduced and one frequently has to overcome the assumption that one is there in a role other than conference attendant."

Several women felt that their ideas were not taken seriously by male colleagues and often experienced non-recognition and interruption, especially in meetings. One wrote of bringing up an idea, only for it to be ignored until a male brought it up, at which time it suddenly was a great idea.

With regard to student-faculty relations, 13 felt that being a woman affected their relations with students. Most mentioned being seen as less authoriatrian and more nurturant than male faculty, regardless of whether or not they wished to be seen this way. Some mentioned a greater difficulty in interacting with male students.

Regarding administrative work, one woman noted that because of limited interaction with senior male colleagues from whom young faculty usually learn administrative techniques, women have more difficulty learning to be effective in policy-making arenas of the university.

Finally, many of the single women mentioned special difficulties in social life in the university. They felt they are frequently not included at gatherings with couples, and that, without a partner, entertaining is more time-consuming and more difficult for them. This affects both their enjoyment of the university community and their opportunities to develop fruitful informal intellectual relationships with their colleagues.

Suggestions for Reform

When asked what changes of policy or attitude they would like to see adopted to improve the situation of female students at the schools they attended, most mentioned policy changes: More female students and faculty (especially in the higher ranks), more flexible programs for married women (part-time study, credit-by-exam, child-care, etc.). But several also stressed the need for more sensitivity to "female lack of self-confidence" and for taking women's work more seriously.

When asked for positive suggestions at UCSD, the response was greater; 17 had ideas. The responses most mentioned were to drop nepotism rules and other practices that discriminate against married women, and to provide more permanent jobs with equal chances for tenure and promotion. The active hiring of more women was also urged by several. The following ideas were mentioned by one or two women each: Tell women the "rules of the game" explicitly because they are less likely to learn informally; change attitudes and terminology that are degrading;

support child care; grant pregnancy leaves; place more women on key Senate and administrative committees (Budget, Privilege and Tenure); appoint women as Regents/Visiting Professors; revise reviewing and advising procedures for non-professorial teaching titles; and place more women in positions of high visibility.

Summary

Santa Cruz women faculty differed widely in the perception of or experience with sex discrimination. But nearly all had encountered it in some form at some time and quite a few felt very strongly about it. Marriage seems to provide more problems for academic women than for academic men. Discrimination often occurs at a level more subtle than policy or percentages; lesser respect and social exclusion are probably just as damaging to women as more overt difficulties. The female faculty want a number of changes to make the roles of the sexes on the academic staff at UCSC more nearly equal.

Respectfully submitted,

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON THE STATUS OF WOMEN AT UCSC

Carolyn Elliott
Walter Goldfrank
Jean Langenheim
Brewster Smith
Anne Reid, Chairman

Student member:

Susan Hubble (Graduate Student)
Joan Jessup
Colleen Parks
Anne Weatherford

MARITAL STATUS AND RANK AMONG FACULTY WOMEN SURVEYED

1971-72

RANK	MARITAL STATUS:			
	Single	Ex-married	Married	Total
Associate Professor	1	3	-	4
Assistant Professor	6	1	-	7
Lecturer	-	3	4	7
Associate Instructor	-	-	2	2
Total	7	7	6	20

APPENDIX #1

EQUAL OPPORTUNITY FOR WOMEN IN FEDERAL EMPLOYMENT AND EMPLOYMENT BY FEDERAL CONTRACTORS

Executive Order 11375. October 13, 1967

Amending Executive Order No. 11246, Relating to Equal Employment Opportunity

It is the policy of the United States Government to provide equal opportunity in Federal employment and in employment by Federal contractors on the basis of merit and without discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex or national origin.

The Congress, by enacting Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, enunciated a national policy of equal employment opportunity in private employment without discrimination because of race, color, religion, sex or national origin.

Executive Order No. 11246 of September 24, 1965, carried forward a program of equal employment opportunity in Government employment, employment by Federal contractors and subcontractors and employment under Federally assisted construction contracts regardless of race, creed, color or national origin.

It is desirable that the equal employment opportunity programs provided for in Executive Order No. 11246 expressly embrace discrimination on account of sex.

NOW, THEREFORE, by virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States by the Constitution and statues of the United States, it ordered that Executive Order No. 11246 of September 24, 1965, be amended as follows:

(1) Section 101 of Part I, concerning nondiscrimination in Government employment, is revised to read as follows:

"SECTION 101. It is the policy of the Government of the United States to provide equal opportunity in Federal employment for all qualified persons, to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, color, religion, sex or national origin, and to promote the full realization of equal employment opportunity through a positive, continuing program in each executive department and agency. The policy of equal opportunity applies to every aspect of Federal employment policy and practice."

(2) SECTION 104 of Part I is revised to read as follows:

"SECTION 104. The Civil Service Commission shall provide for the prompt, fair, and impartial consideration of all complaints of discrimination in Federal employment on the basis of race, color, religion, sex or national origin. Procedures for the consideration of complaints shall include at least one impartial review within the executive department or agency and shall provide for appeal to the Civil Service Commission."

(3) Paragraphs (1) and (2) of the quoted required contract provisions in section 202 of Part II, concerning nondiscrimination in employment by Government contractors and subcontractors, are revised to read as follows:

"(1) The contractor will not discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. The contractor will take affirmative action to ensure that applicants are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their race, color, religion, sex or national origin. Such action shall include, but not be limited to the following:

employment, upgrading, demotion, or transfer; recruitment or recruitment advertising; layoff or termination; rates of pay or other forms of compensation; and selection for training, including apprenticeship. The contractor agrees to post in conspicuous places, available to employees and applicants for employment, notices to be provided by the contracting officer setting forth the provisions of this nondiscrimination clause.

"(2) The contractor will, in all solicitations or advertisement for employees placed by or on behalf of the contractor, state that all qualified applicants will receive consideration for employment without regard to race, color, religion, sex or national origin."

(4) Section 203(d) of Part II is revised to read as follows:

"(d) The contracting agency or the Secretary of Labor may direct that any bidder or prospective contractor or subcontractor shall submit, as part of his Compliance Report, a statement in writing, signed by an authorized officer or agent on behalf of any labor union or any agency referring workers or providing or supervising apprenticeship or training, with which the bidder or prospective contractor deals, with supporting information, to the effect that the signer's practices and policies do not discriminate on the grounds of race, color, religion, sex or national origin, and that the signer either will affirmatively cooperate in the implementation of the policy and provisions of this order or that it consents and agrees that recruitment, employment, and the terms and conditions of employment under the proposed contract shall be in accordance with the purposes and provision of the order. In the event that the union, or the agency shall refuse to execute such a statement, the Compliance Report shall so certify and set forth what efforts have been made to secure a statement and such additional factual material as the contracting agency or the Secretary of Labor may require."

The amendments to Part I shall be effective 30 days after the date of this order. The amendments to Part II shall be effective one year after the date of this order.

signed

LYNDON B. JOHNSON

The White House
October 13, 1967

(Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 5:10 p.m. October 13, 1967)

APPENDIX # 2

EARNED PH.D. DEGREES FROM LEADING UNIVERSITIES (BY SEX)[a]

Academic Area	1962-67 Top 10 Universities[b] M	F	% F
Humanities			
Classics (Latin and Greek combined)	120	33	22
English and Literature	847	231	32
French	100	62	38
Spanish	68	18	21
German	96	28	23
Philosophy	273	27	9
Social Sciences			
Anthropology	233	64	22
Economics	601	33	5
Geography	161	14	8
History	789	111	12
Political Science	496	56	10
Psychology	599	165	22
Sociology	293	53	15
Physical Sciences			
Astronomy	136	10	7
Chemistry	1,381	112	8
Geology (and/or Geophysics)	472	9	2
Mathematics	739	34	4
Physics	1,361	28	2
Biological Sciences			
Microbiology (Bacteriology, Virology, Mycology, Parasitology)	178	38	18
Biochemistry	248	49	14
Biology (General)[c]	163	36	18
Zoology	222	40	15
Botany	181	28	13
Pharmacology	80	11	12
Physiology	87	12	12

[a] Entries represent total number of Ph.D.s granted in each five-year period by the ten top ranking universities. Where Chicago was ranked in the top 10, it has been excluded here and the eleventh university added. Quality rankings for 1955-60 are from H. Keniston, *Graduate Study in the Arts and Sciences at the University of Pennsylvania* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1959). Quality rankings for 1962-67 are from A. M. Cartter, *An Assessment of Quality in Graduate Education* (Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education, 1966). Number of degrees taken from *Earned Degrees Conferred: Bachelor's and Higher Degrees* (Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, annually 1955-56 through 1966-67).

[b] The universities referred to vary from one field to the next and from one time interval to the next. For example, in Classics, 1955-60, they were Harvard, Yale, Princeton, California (all campuses), Columbia, Cornell, Michigan, Johns Hopkins, Illinois, North Carolina; in 1962-67, they were Harvard, Princeton, California at Berkeley, Bryn Mawr, Michigan, Yale, Columbia, Pennsylvania, Cincinnati, North Carolina.

[c] Quality rating for Zoology Departments used for General Biology degrees.

APPENDIX # 3 AS/SCP/351-26

FOR RECRUITMENT AND OTHER INFORMATION CONCERNING WOMEN

WOMEN'S CAUCUSES AND COMMITTEES
and
PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS

Date Formed

AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION (AAA)
Committee on the Status of Women in Anthropology
Chairperson: Prof. Shirley Gorenstein 2/1970
Dept. of Anthropology
Columbia University, New York, NY 10027

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF SCIENCE
Women's Caucus of the A.A.A.S. 12/29/71
Chairperson: Ms. Virginia Walbot
Dept. of Biology
Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 06520

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF UNIVERSITY PROFESSORS (AAUP)
Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession 2/1970
Chairperson: Dr. Alice S. Rossi
Dept. of Sociology
Goucher College, Towson, MD 21204
AAUP Contact: Ms. Margaret Rumbarger
Associate Secretary, AAUP
One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036

AMERICAN COLLEGE PERSONNEL ASSOCIATION (ACPA)
Women's Task Force 12/1970
Chairperson: Dr. Jane E. McCormick
Asst. to Vice-President of Student Affairs
Penn State U.
University Park, Pennsylvania 16802

AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION (AHA)
a. Committee on Women Historians 1/1970
Chairperson: Prof. Patricia A. Graham
Barnard College, New York, N.Y. 10027
(Staff Liaison:
Prof. Dorothy Ross
2914 - 33rd Pl. N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20003)
b. Coordinating Committee on Women in the Historical Profession (CCWHP) 12/69
Chairpersons: Dean Adele Simmons
Jackson College, Tufts U.
Medford, Mass. 02155

Dr. Sandi Cooper
Richmond College, CUNY, Staten Island, N.Y. 10301

AMERICAN LIBRARY ASSOCIATION (ALA)
Social Responsibilities Round Table (SSRT) 6/1970
Task Force on the Status of Women
Chairperson: Ms. Michelle Rudy
1403 LeGore Lane, Manhattan, KS 66502

Date Formed

AMERICAN MATHEMATICAL SOCIETY (AMS)
ASSOCIATION FOR WOMEN IN MATHEMATICS (AWM) (independent group) 1/1971
Chairperson: Prof. Mary Gray, Dept. of Mathematics
The American University
Washington, D.C. 20016

AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION (APA)
Subcommittee on Status of Women in the Profession 12/1969
Chairperson: Prof. Margaret D. Wilson
Dept. of Philosophy, 1879 Hall
Princeton U., Princeton, NJ 08540

AMERICAN PHYSICAL SOCIETY
Committee on Women in Physics 4/25/71
Chairperson: Dr. Vera Kistiakowsky
Nuclear Physics Lab., MIT
Cambridge, MA 02139

AMERICAN POLITICAL SCIENCE ASSOCIATION (APSA)
a. Committee on the Status of Women in the Profession 3/1969
Chairperson: Dr. Josephine E. Milburn
U. of Rhode Island, Kingston, RI 02881
b. Women's Caucus for Political Science (WCPS) 9/1969
Chairperson: Dr. Evelyn P. Stevens
14609 S. Woodland Rd., Shaker, Hgts., OH 44120
Mail to: WCPS
Box 9099, Pittsburgh, PA 15224

AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION (APA)
a. Task Force on the Status of Women in Psychology 9/1969
Chairperson: Dr. Helen Astin, Director of Research
University Research Corp.
4301 Connecticut Ave., N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20008
(Staff Liaison: Dr. Tena Cummings
APA, 1200 - 17th St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036)
b. Association for Women in Psychology (AWP) is an independent group, initially a caucus within APA) 9/1969
Policy Council to be announced
Editor: Dr. Leigh Marlowe
Manhattan Community College
180 West End Ave., New York, NY 10023
Public Relations: Dr. Jo-Ann Evans Gardner
726 St. James St., Pittsburgh, PA 15232

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR MICROBIOLOGY
Committee on the Status of Women Microbiologists
Chairperson: Dr. Mary Louise Robbins
Medical School, 1339 - H St.
The George Washington University
Washington, D.C. 20005

AMERICAN SOCIETY FOR PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
Task Force on Women in Public Administration
Chairperson: Mrs. Joan Fiss Bishop
Director of Career Services
Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA 02181

Date formed

AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION (ASA)

a. Ad Hoc Committee on the Status of Women in Sociology — 12/1970
Chairperson: Dr. Elise Boulding
Behavioral Science Institute
U. of Colorado, Boulder, CO 80302

b. Sociologists for Women in Society (SWS) (independent group formerly caucus) — 6/1969
Chairperson: Dr. Alice Rossi
Dept. of Sociology
Goucher College, Towson, MD 21204

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF TRAINING AND DEVELOPMENT (ASTD)

Women's Caucus, ASTD — 5/1970
Steering Committee: Dr. Shirley McCune
Center for Human Relations
NEA, 1601 16th St., N.W. Washington, D.C. 20036

Ms. Althea Simmons, Dr. of Training
NAACP, 200 E 27th St.
New York, N.Y. 10016

AMERICAN SPEECH AND HEARING ASSOCIATION (ASHA)

a. Subcommittee on the Status of Women
Chairperson: Mrs. Dorothy K. Marge
8011 Longbrook Rd., Springfield, VA 22152

b. Caucus on Status of Women in ASHA (same as above) — 8/19/70

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN LAW SCHOOLS (AALS)

Women in the Legal Profession
Chairperson: Prof. Ruth B. Ginsburg
School of Law, Rutgers University
Newark, NJ 07104

ASSOCIATION OF ASIAN STUDIES

Committee on the Status of Women
Chairperson: Prof. Joyce K. Kallgren
Center for Chinese Studies
2168 Shattuck Ave., Berkeley, CA 94705

ASSOCIATION OF WOMEN IN SCIENCE (independent group) — 4/13/71
Co-Presidents: Dr. Judith G. Pool
Stanford Medical School
Stanford University, Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Neena B. Schwartz
Dept. of Psychiatry, College of Medicine
U. of Illinois at the Medical Center
P.O. Box 6998, Chicago, IL 60680

MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION (MLA)

a. MLA Commission on the Status of Women in the Profession — 12/1968
Chairperson: Dr. Carol Ohmann
Wesleyan U., Middletown, Conn. 06457

b. Women's Caucus of the NEA
President: Dr. Verna Wittrock
Dept. of English
Eastern Illinois U., Charleston, IL 61920

NATIONAL COUNCIL ON FAMILY RELATIONS (NCFR)
Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities
Chairperson: Dr. Rose Somerville
Sociology Dept.
San Diego State College, San Diego, CA 92115

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION
Women's Caucus
Chairperson: Mrs. Helen Bain
NEA, 1201 - 16th St., Washington, D.C. 20036

NATIONAL VOCATIONAL GUIDANCE ASSOCIATION (NVGA)
NVGA Commission on the Occupational Status of Women — 11/1968
Chairperson: Mrs. Thelma C. Lennon, Director
Pupil Personnel Services, Dept of Public Instruction
Raleigh, NC 27602

PHILOSOPHY OF EDUCATION SOCIETY
a. Women's Caucus — 4/1971
Chairperson: Dr. Elizabeth Steiner Maccia
Department of History and Philosophy of Education
Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47401
b. Committee on the Status of Women (same as above) — 4/1971

POPULATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA
Women's Caucus — 4/1970
Chairperson: Prof. Ruth B. Dixon
Department of Sociology
University of California, Davis, Davis, CA 95616

PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CAUCUS (PWC)
P.O. Box 1057, Radio City Station, New York, NY 10019 — 4/1970
Pres: Sheila Tobias, Ass. Provost
Wesleyan U., Middletown, CT 06457

SOCIETY FOR CELL BIOLOGY
Women in Cell Biology — 11/20/71
Chairperson: Ms. Virginia Walbot
Dept. of Biology
Yale University, New Haven, Conn. 06520

UNITED PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN THE USA
Task Force on Women — 9/1969
Co-Chairpersons: Patricia Doyle and Elaine Romrighouse
Board of Christian Education
United Presbyterian Church, Witherspoon Bldg.
Philadelphia, PA 19107

Prepared by Dr. Ruth Oltman
Staff Associate - Higher Education
American Association of University Women
2401 Virginia Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20037

Distributed by: Project on the Status and Education of Women
Association of American Colleges
1818 R Street, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20009

APPENDIX # 4

PERSONNEL RULE REVISED REGARDING NEAR RELATIVES

With the July 28 revision of Section 113 of the Administrative Manual and Staff Personnel Rule 7.6, University policy prohibiting the employment of near relatives in the same department was abandoned.

Essentially a switch in language from negative to positive, the Section provides for the hiring of near relatives in the same department under these conditions:

1. Recommendations for employment involving near relations shall contain notation of such fact, and an analysis of the possible conflict of interest or other disadvantage.

2. No member of the University staff shall participate in the review and decision-making processes or other matters concerning promotion, retention, or termination of a near relative.

3. Appointment to a department where a near relative situation exists is subject to review and approval by the Chancellor (or Vice President).

Circumstances under which such concurrent employment may arise are:

1. Two employees already holding positions in the same department subsequently become near relatives.

2. Simultaneous appointment of near relatives in the same department is recommended.

3. Appointment of one who is the near relative of an individual already employed in the same department is recommended.

Near relatives include parents and children, husband, wife, brother, sister, brother-in-law, son-in-law, daughter-in-law; and step relatives in the same relationship.

Vice President McCorkle, in his memo of November 22, states: "This policy is consistent with nondiscrimination to assure employees and prospective employees equal employment opportunity."

The previous policy, referred to informally as the "nepotism rule," discouraged academic appointments to wives of UC faculty members, and was therefore felt to be discriminatory on the basis of sex.

- from University Bulletin, Vol.20, No. 13, February 7, 1972